UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

LYNNE M. NILL, et ux.,			: Case No. C-1-01-755	
	Plaintiffs,		: Judge S. Beckwith, J. Hogan, M.J.	
v.			: :	
PER al.,	RIGO SA	LES CORPORATION, et	: :	
	Defend	ants.	: :	
		RULE 26(f) REPO	ORT OF THE PARTIES	
atte	1. nded by:	Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26	(f), a meeting was held on June 8, 2004, and was	
	G. Todo	-	aintiffs efendant Perrigo Sales Corporation efendant Bristol-Myers Squibb Company	
		will exchange such disclo	re under Rule 26(a)(1)(E); and/or	
		United States Magistrate Judg	ne jurisdiction of, and entry of judgment by, the e pursuant to 28 USC 636(c); and/or ent to the jurisdiction of an entry of judgment by the e pursuant to 28 USC 636(c).	
		Recommended cut-off date for add additional parties: <u>Time a</u>	r filing any motion to amend the pleadings and/or to already expired	

- 5. Is the case appropriate for mediation after a limited discovery period? No (Mediation was held on April 30, 2004, and was unsuccessful.) Will the parties request the services of a court mediator? No Has a settlement demand been made? Yes Date by which a settlement demand can be made? N/A Date by which a response can be made to settlement demand? N/A
- 6. Recommended Discovery Plan:
 - Describe the subjects on which discovery is to be sought and the nature and extent of discovery that each party needs to: (1) make a settlement evaluation; (2) prepare for case dispositive motions, and (3) prepare for trial:

Case-specific expert discovery remains to be completed. In addition, limited case-specific fact discovery may be completed consistent with the MDL Court's final pretrial order. Generic expert discovery was conducted in the MDL. However, the parties may designate experts and/or expert testimony different from or in addition to the generic expert discovery in the MDL consistent with the MDL Court's Final Pretrial Order and the MDL Court's Stipulation and Order Regarding Expert Disclosures dated September 9, 2002.

What changes should be made, if any, in the limitations on discovery imposed under the Fed. R. Civ. P. or the S.D. Ohio Civ. Rules, including the limitations to twenty-five (25) interrogatories, forty (40) requests for admissions, and the limitation of ten (10) depositions, each lasting no more than one sevenhour day?

The parties agree that depositions of expert witnesses may exceed the seven-hour limitation imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, if necessary.

Additional recommended limitations on expansions of discovery: c.

Not applicable.

Describe the areas for which expert testimony is expected and indicate whether each expert will be specifically retained within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(f):

Case-specific expert discovery relative to many areas, including but not limited to causation, damages, labeling, or regulatory issues, as well as testimony from economist on case-specific issues. The parties cannot state at this time whether each expert will be "specifically retained."

2 268910.1 26439.2

The parties were unable to reach an agreement regarding disclosure of expert witnesses and agreed to submit two proposals to the Court for discussion at the preliminary pretrial conference.

Plaintiffs' Proposal:

- e. Recommended date for identifying primary experts: 9/15/04
- f. Recommended date for producing primary expert reports: 9/15/04
- g. Recommended date for identifying rebuttal experts: 11/1/04
- h. Recommended date for producing rebuttal expert reports: 11/1/04
- i. Recommended discovery cut-off date: 12/5/04

Defendants' Proposal:

- e. Recommended date for identifying Plaintiffs' primary experts, preliminary witness list, and preliminary exhibit list for trial: 9/15/04
 - Recommended date for identifying Defendants' primary experts, preliminary witness list, and preliminary exhibit list for trial: 11/1/04
- f. Recommended date for producing Plaintiffs' primary expert reports: 9/15/04
 - Recommended date for producing Defendants' primary expert reports: 11/1/04
- g. Recommended date for identifying Plaintiffs' rebuttal experts: 11/15/04
 - Recommended date for identifying Defendants' rebuttal experts: 11/30/04
- h. Recommended date for producing Plaintiffs' rebuttal expert reports: 11/1/04
 - Recommended date for producing Defendants' rebuttal expert reports: 11/30/04
- i. Recommended discovery cut-off date: 12/30/04

The parties submit the following without dispute:

- 7. Recommended dispositive motion deadline: <u>1/31/05</u>
- 8. Recommended date for final pretrial conference: <u>5/31/05</u> (at least four (4) months after dispositive motion deadline)

268910.1 26439.2

- 9. Recommended date for trial: <u>7/18/05</u> (at least one (1) month after final pretrial conference)
- 10. Other matters for the attention of the Court:

 Daubert motions and hearing; other pretrial motions (e.g., motons in limine)

SIGNATURES:

/s/ Calvin S. Tregre, Jr./Denise M. Smith

(per authority)

Beverly H. Pace (#037534) Calvin S. Tregre, Jr. (#073454) LOPEZ HODES RESTAINO MILMAN SKIKOS & POLOS 312 Walnut Street, Suite 2090 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Tel: (513) 852-5600 Fax: (513) 852-381-5823

E-Mail: ctregre@lopez-hodes.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

/s/ G. Todd Hoffpauir/Denise M. Smith

(per authority)

James J. Montgomery (#018656) G. Todd Hoffpauir, (#064449) MONTGOMERY RENNIE & JONSON 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 2100 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Tel: (513) 241-4722 Fax: (513) 241-8775 E-Mail: ghoffpauir@mrj.cc ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT PERRIGO SALES CORPORATION

/s/ Denise M. Smith

Denise M. Smith (#067604) ULMER & BERNE LLP 600 Vine Street, Suite 2800 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 Tel: (513) 698-5000 Fax: (513) 698-5968

E-Mail: dsmith@ulmer.com

Craig A. Marvinney (#0004951) ULMER & BERNE LLP

JUNIER & DERIVE LLF

Penton Media Building, Suite 900

1300 East Ninth Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114 Tel: (216) 931-6000

Fax: (216) 931-6001

E-Mail: cmarvinney@ulmer.com
ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY

268910.1 26439.2 4